

**Remarks**

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the Application.

**Allowable Claims**

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's indication of allowability as to Claims 7-15.

**Claim 1-23**

This response amends Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 15 and 17 to clarify the language of the claims. Support for the amendments can, for example, be found in Figure 9.

**Informality Objections - Claims 1, 7 and 17**

Applicants note that the claims have been amended and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection**

Claims 1-4, 6 and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Crane (U.S. Patent No. 6,150,772). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is reminded that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co, of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner is also reminded that “[the] identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The Applicants submit that Crane does not teach each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

Claim 1

Applicants submit that Crane does not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by amended Claim 1 of the present application:

**“...a second coil set and a third coil set wrapped around the core and respectively disposed on first and second sides of the first coil set ...”**  
(emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that “a first coil set” as recited in Claim 1 is disclosed by Crane’s coils disposed below a transformer “160.” See page 3, lines 1-5 of the Official Action. The Examiner also asserts that “a second coil set and a third coil set” as recited in Claim 1 is disclosed by Crane’s coils disposed above the transformer “160.” See page 3, lines 1-5 of the Official Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s assertion.

According to Crane, coil sets are disposed above and below the transformer “160.” See Figure 2c of Crane. Contrary to the teaching of Crane, amended Claim 1 recites that “a second coil set and a third coil set ... disposed on first and second sides of the first coil,” **not** above and below a transformer as taught by Crane in Figure 2c.

Applicants submit that Crane does not teach, disclose or suggest “a second coil set and a third coil set wrapped around the core and respectively disposed on first and second sides of the first coil set” as recited in amended Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Crane and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-16, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Crane.

Claim 17

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Crane does not teach, disclose or suggest “a plurality of second coil sets wrapped around the core and symmetrically disposed on first and second sides of the first coil set” as recited in

amended Claim 17. Hence, Claim 17 is patentable over Crane and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 18-22, at least based on their dependency on Claim 17, are also believed to be patentable over Crane.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Crane and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,717,372).

Applicants submit that Claim 5, at least based on its dependency on Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Crane and Lin, because there is no prima facie 35 USC 103(a) case based on Crane, as shown above, and because the Examiner has not shown to the Applicants where Lin discloses, teaches or suggests the features not found in Crane.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents POB 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

July 18, 2005

(Date of Deposit)

Elizabeth McNerney


(Name of Person Signing)

  
(Signature)

July 18, 2005

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300